REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Initially, the indication that Claims 21-36 are withdrawn is noted.

Claims 37-39 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, the errant word "at" has been removed from Claim 37.

Claims 37-38, 40-41 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as allegedly being unpatentable over Lemaire et al. Claims 39 and 42 stand rejected over Lemaire et al. in view of Chander et al. Claims 37 and 40 have been amended herewith to emphasize their patentable distinctions. These amendments emphasize how the rejection does not meet the patent office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability.

Claim 37 defines receiving an alert from one of the plurality of recipients, generating a data field that identifies at least one target recipient, generating a second data field that indicates the type of alert management message, and transmitting the data fields to the recipients. The type of alert management message is based on the alert.

Lemaire et al., in contrast, teaches a communication system which allows sending information to multiple different message

12

recipients. There is no teaching or suggestion that the message

recipient is an "alert"; much less the kind of alert which can

be managed according to an alert management message. In order

to even further distinguish over the prior art, Claim 37 is

amended to recite that the alert is one which can be of a

plurality of different types. With all due respect, therefore,

Lemaire et al. does not disclose receiving an "alert" of this

type. The cited section defines answering a telephone call, but

this is not an alert which can be used to set a type of alert

management message. Claim 37 has also been amended to specify

that the type of alert management message is based on the type

of alert. This further distinguishes over Lemaire et al.

In addition, Claim 37 requires a first data field that

identifies the target recipient and a second data field that

identifies the type of alert management message. The rejection

alleges that the "classification information" reads on the type

of alert management message. With all due respect, there is no

suggestion that the classification information has anything to

do with the type of the alert. The only disclosure of the

"classification message" is in Lemaire et al. column 2 line 42-

43. One might postulate that it has something to do with

classification of something -- however, there is no teaching or

suggestion that this classification is based on the <u>type of the</u>

alert, as claimed. Claim 40 has also been amended to recite
that the alert can be one of a plurality of different types of
alerts. Claim 40 should be additionally allowable for these
reasons.

The dependent claims should be additionally allowable for
analogous reasons to those discussed above with respect to the
respective independent claims, as well as on their own merits.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been
addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific
rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or
concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition,
because the arguments made above are not intended to be
exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all
pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.
Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent
to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as
specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any
claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability
of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. No fee is

believed to be due, however please apply any other charges or

credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __April 6, 2006__   _____
                                 Scott C. Harris
                                 Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
PTO Customer No. 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10597486.doc